Hovsepian v. Apple, Inc. Doc. 167

LAW OFFICES
KEKER & VAN NEST
LLP
710 SANSOME STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-1704
TELEPHONE (415) 391-5400
FAX (415) 397-7188
WWW.KVN.COM

DAN JACKSON
DJACKSON@KVN.COM

May 15, 2006

VIA EFILING

The Honorable James Ware
United States District Court
Northern District of California
Courtroom 8
280 South First St.
San Jose, CA 95113

Melissa Peralta, Courtroom Deputy
United States District Court
Northern District of California
Courtroom 8
280 South First St.
San Jose, CA 95113

Re: ***In re Acacia Media Technologies Corp.***
Case No. C 05-1114 (MDL 1665)

Dear Judge Ware and Ms. Peralta:

I represent Comcast Cable Communications, LLC and Insight Communications, Inc. in the coordinated Acacia patent-infringement litigation. On behalf of Defendants,[1] I am writing in response to the Court's Order dated May 10, 2006, ordering the parties to inform the Courtroom Deputy if more than three hours will be needed for the Claim Construction hearing and hearing on the motion for summary judgment now scheduled for June 9, 2006 from 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. We believe that more than three hours will certainly be necessary, and that, in fact, the parties will likely require two days to address the matters scheduled to be heard.

---

[1] The following defendants join in this letter: Comcast Cable Communications LLC; Insight Communications, Inc.; EchoStar Satellite LLC; EchoStar Technologies Corp.; The DIRECTV Group, Inc.; Cable One, Inc.; Mediacom Communications Corporation; Bresnan Communications; Cequel III Communications I, LLC (dba Cebridge Connections); Charter Communications, Inc.; Armstrong Group; Block Communications, Inc.; East Cleveland Cable TV and Communications LLC; Wide Open West Ohio LLC; Massillon Cable TV, Inc.; Mid-Continent Media, Inc.; US Cable Holdings LP; Savage Communications, Inc.; Sjoberg's Cablevision, Inc.; Loretel Cablevision; Arvig Communications Systems; Cannon Valley Communications, Inc.; NPG Cable, Inc.; Coxcom, Inc.; Hospitality Network, Inc.; Time Warner Cable, Inc.; and CSC Holdings, Inc.

Dockets.Justia.com

In addition to Acacia, which has proposed many constructions that differ from any of the defendants' proposed constructions, there are two different groups of defendants, which we have referred to as the "Round 1 and 2," and "Round 3" defendants, which have each proposed constructions that differ somewhat from the other's, as well as from Acacia's. These two groups of defendants wish to be heard separately on many of the terms at issue. There are 49 terms in the Joint Chart of the Parties' Proposed Definitions. Not all of those terms are of the same importance, and they will presumably not all require an equal amount of argument; several may not require argument at all. Nevertheless, the number and nature of the disputes is such that the Court will probably need two days to hear all of the matters at issue.

We would be happy to arrange a conference call to discuss these scheduling issues if the Court believes that it would be useful.

Respectfully submitted,

Dan Jackson

DEJ/msc

cc: All Counsel of Record (via efiling)